

REMARKS

Claims 1-83 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 74-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has correct the noted errors in Claims 74, 78 and 83 as requested by the Examiner. These amendments are not narrowing amendments. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 14, 19, 32, 37, 50, 54, 62-64, 72-75, and 82-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meier, U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0232213 in view of Meier, U.S. Pat. No. 6,714,559. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claim 1, Meier 2005/0232213 fails to show, teach or suggest an access point that transmits and receives radio frequency (RF) signals, that wirelessly communicates with said plurality of nodes, **that generates a table containing a list of nodes operating in said wireless network, and that broadcasts said table to said plurality of nodes.**

The Examiner alleges that paragraph [0044] of Meier 2005/0232213 teaches the access point limitations set forth above. Applicant respectfully asserts that paragraph

[0044] of Meier fails to show, teach or suggest an access point **that generates a table containing a list of nodes** operating in said wireless network, and **that broadcasts said table** to said plurality of nodes as recited in Claim 1. Paragraph [0044] of Meier is set forth below:

HELLO packets contain 1) the address of the sender, 2) the hopping distance that the sender is from the root, 3) a source address, 4) a count of nodes in the subtree which flow through that bridge, and 5) a list of system parameters. Each node in the network is assigned a unique network service address and a node-type identifier to distinguish between different nodes and different node types. The distance of a node from the root node is measured in hops times the bandwidth of each hop. The gateway root is considered to be zero hops away from itself. The unattached bridges are in a LISTEN state. During the LISTEN state, a bridge will listen to the HELLO messages that are broadcast. By listening to the HELLO messages, bridges can learn which nodes are attached to the spanning tree. The unattached bridges analyze the contents of the HELLO messages to determine whether to request attachment to the broadcasting node. In the preferred embodiment, a bridge attempts to attach to the node that is logically closest to the root node. In the preferred embodiment, the logical distance is based upon the number of hops needed to reach the root node and the bandwidth of those hops. The distance the attached node is away from the root node is found in the second field of the HELLO message that is broadcast.

At best, this section discusses sending a count of nodes. However, a **COUNT of nodes** is not the same as a **table containing a list of nodes**.

Claims 1 is allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 19, 37, 54, 64 and 74 are allowable for at least similar reasons. The remaining Claims depend directly or indirectly on Claims 1, 19, 37, 54, 64 and 74 and are allowable for at least similar reasons.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 76-81 would be allowable if rewritten in to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph. Additionally, claims 2-7, 12-13, 15-18, 20-26, 30-31, 33-36, 38-42, 47-49. 51-53, 55-61, 65-71 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant will presently refrain from rewriting these Claims into independent form at this time. Applicant reserves the right to amend these Claims into their originally allowable form at a later date if needed.

CONCLUSION


It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3-10-06

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDW/mp

By: 
Michael D. Wiggins
Reg. No. 34,754